

very clearly that Police Commissioner Gilmore's intentions expressed to the witness Pearce, and admitted by himself in his testimony before the Committee in the Police Commissioners investigation, to "prevent the Radicals and negroes from carrying the election," was no idle boast, whether spoken ex cathedra or in private capacity. It is plain, therefore, that there must have been a much smaller legal vote cast at the State than at the Municipal election. Yet the returned vote of the State election exceeds that of the Municipal by 5,314.

The explanation is found in the fact, as shown by the evidence, not only that there were over 5,000 fraudulent ballots (self-convicted as such,) counted in the official returns for these respondents, but also that there was gross and generally prevailing fraud, so marked, indeed in some localities, viz: the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 8th and 9th wards, that the vote returned was absurdly disproportioned to the population, and glaringly in excess of the registered vote.

Again, there is a striking discrepancy between the proportion borne by the total vote returned at the two elections to the respective Democratic majorities claimed. Thus we find the Democratic candidate for Mayor claiming only a majority of 2,665, out of a total vote of 53,607; while the Democratic candidate for Governor rolls up the enormous majority of 14,495, out of a total vote of 58,921.

Remembering always that this magical change of votes was accomplished in the interval of five (5) days between the two elections, with the issues and parties the same, and the canvass practically closed on the eve of the first election, and the personal popularity and standing of the Democratic candidate for Mayor equal, if not superior to that of any Democratic candidate at the State election; and especially that the change in many precincts is slight, and in those immediately adjoining enormous, and that the latter precincts are invariably those in which the evidence establishes the prevalence of fraud or violence, and very frequently, also, changes in judges and clerks between the two elections, and that in those precincts where only slight changes occur, the reformers as a rule have a majority at both elections, while in those where great changes occur the Democrats made large gains, that in every precinct where there are votes without names to account for them, the poll-books of the Democratic and Reform clerks not only agree as to the number of voters with each other, but very nearly with the official return of the municipal election, and finally, that in every precinct of which no complaint is made, and particularly wherein the election is pointedly shown to have been fair, the majority almost invariably is for the re-